



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/632,741  | 08/01/2003  | John Frederick Ackerman | RD-26408-5          | 3858             |
| John S. Beulick<br>Armstrong Teasdale LLP<br>Suite 2600<br>One Metropolitan Square<br>St. Louis, MO 63102 |             |                         |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER<br>PERRIN, JOSEPH L.   |             |                         |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT<br>1792  |             |                         |                     |                  |
| PAPER NUMBER  |             |                         |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE<br>05/16/2008   |             |                         |                     |                  |
| DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER  |             |                         |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/632,741

**Applicant(s)**

ACKERMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D.

**Art Unit**

1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D., USPTO.(3) Salvatore B. Gianino, applicants' representative.(2) William, J. Zychlewicz, applicants' representative.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 May 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: BARTOS and BECK.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representatives contacted the Examiner to discuss options in addressing the prior art rejections. While changes to structurally define the claimed apparatus that addressed the prior art were discussed, no agreement was reached. The Examiner further noted that the application was under final rejection and that any significant changes to the claims would require further consideration and possibly further search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Joseph L. Perrin/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required